

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JUAN TIBURCIO

Petitioner,

v.

SUPERINTENDENT MELINDA
ADAMS, et al.,

Respondents.

CIVIL ACTION
NO. 24-2617

ORDER

AND NOW, this 22nd day of May 2025, upon consideration of Petitioner Juan Tibrucio's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. No. 1), the Government's Answer to the Petition (Doc. No. 6), the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") issued by United States Magistrate Judge Carol Sandra Moore Wells (Doc. No. 9), Petitioner's Objections to the R&R (Doc. No. 12), a review of the pertinent state court record, and in accordance with the Opinion of the Court issued this day, it is **ORDERED** that the R&R (Doc. No. 9) is **ADOPTED** with the modifications as explained in the Opinion, and the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. No. 1) is **DENIED**.

No certificate of appealability shall be issued because Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the claims debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joel H. Slomsky, J.
JOEL H. SLOMSKY, J.